UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/547,689 | 01/25/2007 | Richard Percy | 2105-00021 | 7022 |

26753 7590 02/21/2008

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP
100 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 1100
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| BROMELL, ALEXANDRIA Y | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2167 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 02/21/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/547,689 | PERCY, RICHARD | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | ALEXANDRIA Y. BROMELL | 2167 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *44-91* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *44-91* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 September 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/20/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is a 371 of PCT/GB04/00896, filed 3/3/04, which claims priority to United Kingdom 0304782.6, filed 3/3/03. Claims 1-43 have been cancelled, claims 44-91 are pending, and are considered below.

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 3/2/05 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### *Claim Objections*

Claims 44, 52, 56, 61, 62, and 79 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The use of "and/or" is not clear and renders the claim indefinite. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 44-61, 63-64, 66, 68, 70, 72, 75-77, 82, and 88-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 44-61, 63- 64, 66, 68, 70, 72, 75-77, and 82 are rejected as falling under the judicial exception of an abstract idea which lacks a useful, concrete, and tangible result. A claimed series of steps or acts that do not result in a useful, concrete, and tangible result are not statutory within the meaning of 35 USC 101. In the instant case,

instant case, the claims recite, "accessing or receiving information," "retrieving or receiving," and "performing a search." However, no useful, concrete, and tangible result is claimed. For example, "writing said data," "updating said data," "sending said data" being claimed at the end of the claim may comprise a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Absent such a result, however, the claims are not statutory.

Claims 88 – 91 lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because

"[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.").

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 44-47, 49- 67, and 70-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulter ("Computing Classification System 1998: Current Status and Future Maintenance Report of the CCS Update Committee", ACM, pages 1-5, January 1998) in view of ACM ("The ACM Computing Classification System (1998)", December 1998, pages 1-30).

With respect to claim 44, Coulter teaches accessing or receiving information stored in electronic or other form (i.e. Association for Computing Machinery Computing Classification Systems provides access to electronic information, including published

literature, page 1). Coulter does not explicitly disclose the use of alpha numeric codes. However, ACM teaches the use of alpha-numeric codes (i.e. alpha numeric codes are used for classification, page 1), wherein the codes comprise one or more alpha-numeric sub-codes in a hierarchical structure and wherein the sub-codes and/or codes are used to identify, describe, define, classify or encode a description of the content of said information (i.e. codes are in hierarchical structure, and are used to classify content, page 1). Coulter and ACM are from the same field of endeavor of allowing data to be classified by the ACM Computing Classification System. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Coulter and ACM before him or her, to modify the system of Coulter with the teachings of ACM in order to show a detailed view of how the documents are classified (ACM, page 1). The motivation for doing so would have been to show the classification codes and sub-codes (ACM, page 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine ACM with Coulter to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claims.

With respect to claim 45, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes in a hierarchical structure. However, ACM teaches wherein a code comprising n sub-codes provide for n levels in the hierarchical structure (i.e. section A: General Literature, has 4 levels of sub-codes in the hierarchical structure, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 45 are rejected in the analysis of claim 44 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 46, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose numeric codes. However, ACM teaches wherein the sub-codes are numeric (i.e. sub-codes can be numeric: A.0: General where A is the code and 0 is the sub-code, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 46 are rejected in the analysis of claim 44 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 47, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose classification codes. However, ACM teaches wherein said sub-codes comprise a two digit code (i.e. sub-codes may be made up of two digits – B.1.0, which can be written B.01.00, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 47 are rejected in the analysis of claim 44 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 49, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose classification codes. However, ACM teaches wherein the codes include a sequence of one or more of said numeric or alpha-numeric sub-codes (i.e. codes include at least one alpha-numeric or numeric sub-code – A.2 or A.m, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 495 are rejected in the analysis of claim 44 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 50, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose classification codes. However, ACM teaches wherein the

codes comprise a sequence of two digit sub-codes (i.e. the code for Hardware-General is B.0.0 and hardware – Control Structures & Microprogramming General is B.1.0, which have two sub-codes in sequence (B.00.00 and B.01.00), page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 50 are rejected in the analysis of claim 47 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 51,Coulter teaches wherein said codes are stored together with links in electronic or other form, said links being usable for accessing or receiving said information (i.e. the ACM database can be searched using the computing classification system codes and sub-codes, and electronic information can be accessed through the website, page 1).

With respect to claim 52,Coulter teaches wherein the sub-codes and/or codes are used to navigate to desired or associated links or information (i.e. codes and sub-codes are used to search indexed information, page 1).

With respect to claim 53, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose classification codes. However, ACM teaches wherein each of the sub-codes at each level of the hierarchical structure is associated with a certain subject-term (i.e. nodes at each level in the hierarchy are associated with a certain subject – line the subject for B.1.1 is control Design Styles, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 53 are rejected in the analysis of claim 44 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 54, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose classification codes. However, ACM teaches wherein the codes consist solely of a combination of said sub-codes (A. General Literature, is a combination of A.0, A.1, A.2, and A.m, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 54 are rejected in the analysis of claim 44 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 55, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose classification codes. However, ACM teaches wherein information assigned a particular code relates either i) to the subject-term associated with said particular code if the code includes a single sub-code (i.e. A.1 includes only one single sub-category, page 1), or ii) to all subject-terms associated with all sub-codes of said particular code if the code includes more than one sub-code (i.e. B.1.4 also includes D.2.2, D.2.4, D.3.2, and D.3.4, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 55 are rejected in the analysis of claim 44 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 56, Coulter teaches wherein one or more of said codes are distributed together with information and/or products (i.e. the classification system uses codes to index and classify information, page 1).

With respect to claim 57, Coulter teaches wherein an indexing function is provided at each level of said hierarchical structure (i.e. indexing is done for each level in the hierarchy, and for each source, page 3!).

With respect to claim 58, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose a hierarchical structure. However, ACM teaches wherein at each level of said hierarchical structure data related to subject-terms associated with the sub-codes are available upon entering a particular sub-code (i.e. when you access B.1.1 – Control design Styles, you also have access to Hardwired control, Microprogrammed logic arrays, and Writable control store, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 58 are rejected in the analysis of claim 57 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 59, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose classification codes. However, ACM teaches wherein one or more of the sub-codes are converted into the associated subject-terms (i.e. sub codes correspond with the section titles or categories, for example, everyone would know that B.1.5 deals with Microde Applications, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 59 are rejected in the analysis of claim 53 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 60, Coulter teaches wherein codes complemented by subject-terms are used to search for, access or receive information (i.e. Association for Computing Machinery Computing Classification Systems provides access to electronic information, including published literature, page 1).

With respect to claim 61, Coulter teaches a base or a network of databases (i.e. ACM database system is a repository of documents, page 1), Coulter does not the use

of codes for classification. However, ACM teaches the method comprising the use of codes (i.e. alpha numeric codes are used for classification, page 1), wherein the codes include one or more numeric or alpha-numeric sub-codes in a hierarchical structure, and wherein the sub-codes and/or codes are used to identify, describe, define, classify or encode a description of the content of said information (i.e. codes are in hierarchical structure, and are used to classify content, page 1), and wherein a code of n sub-codes is used to navigate to level n in the hierarchical structure (i.e. section A: General Literature, has 4 levels of sub-codes in the hierarchical structure, page 1). Coulter and ACM are from the same field of endeavor of allowing data to be classified by the ACM Computing Classification System. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Coulter and ACM before him or her, to modify the system of Coulter with the teachings of ACM in order to show a detailed view of how the documents are classified (ACM, page 1). The motivation for doing so would have been to show the classification codes and sub-codes (ACM, page 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine ACM with Coulter to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claims.

With respect to claim 62, Coulter teaches storing links and/or structuring links stored in electronic or other form (i.e. the ACM database can be searched using the computing classification system codes and sub-codes, and electronic information can be accessed through the website, page 1). Coulter does not the use of codes for classification. However, ACM teaches the method comprising storing the links to information associated with said codes (i.e. alpha numeric codes are used for

classification, page 1), wherein the codes include one or more numeric sub-codes in a hierarchical structure and wherein the sub-codes and/or codes are used to identify, describe, define classify or encode a description of the content of said information (i.e. codes are in hierarchical structure, and are used to classify content, page 1). Coulter and ACM are from the same field of endeavor of allowing data to be classified by the ACM Computing Classification System. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Coulter and ACM before him or her, to modify the system of Coulter with the teachings of ACM in order to show a detailed view of how the documents are classified (ACM, page 1). The motivation for doing so would have been to show the classification codes and sub-codes (ACM, page 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine ACM with Coulter to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claims.

With respect to claim 63, Coulter teaches retrieving or receiving information from a database or a data network (i.e. ACM database system is a repository of documents, page 1).

With respect to claim 64, Coulet teaches a hierarchical structure (page 1). Coulter does not the use of codes for classification. However, ACM teaches encoding information into numeric or alpha-numeric codes (i.e. alpha numeric codes are used for classification, page 1), wherein the codes include one or more numeric or alpha-numeric sub-codes in a hierarchical structure (i.e. codes are in hierarchical structure, and are used to classify content, page 1). Coulter and ACM are from the same field of endeavor of allowing data to be classified by the ACM Computing Classification System.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Coulter and ACM before him or her, to modify the system of Coulter with the teachings of ACM in order to show a detailed view of how the documents are classified (ACM, page 1). The motivation for doing so would have been to show the classification codes and sub-codes (ACM, page 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine ACM with Coulter to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claims.

With respect to claim 65, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein a code comprising n sub-codes provide for n levels in the hierarchical structure (i.e. section A: General Literature, has 4 levels of sub-codes in the hierarchical structure, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 65 are rejected in the analysis of claim 62 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 66, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein said sub-codes comprise a two digit code (i.e. sub-codes may be made up of two digits – B.1.0, which can be written B.01.00, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 66 are rejected in the analysis of claim 61 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 67, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter

does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein said sub-codes comprise a two digit code (i.e. sub-codes may be made up of two digits – B.1.0, which can be written B.01.00, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 67 are rejected in the analysis of claim 62 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 70, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein the codes include a sequence of one or more of said numeric or alpha-numeric sub-codes (i.e. codes include at least one alpha-numeric or numeric sub-code – A.2 or A.m, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 70 are rejected in the analysis of claim 61 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 71, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein the codes include a sequence of one or more of said numeric or alpha-numeric sub-codes (i.e. codes include at least one alpha-numeric or numeric sub-code – A.2 or A.m, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 71 are rejected in the analysis of claim 62 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 72, Coulter teaches wherein said codes are stored together with links in electronic or other form, said links being usable for accessing or receiving said information (i.e. the ACM database can be searched using the computing

classification system codes and sub-codes, and electronic information can be accessed through the website, page 1).

With respect to claim 73, Coulter teaches wherein the subcodes and/or codes are used to navigate to desired or associated links or information (i.e. codes and sub-codes are used to search indexed information, page 1).

With respect to claim 74, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein each of the sub-codes at each level of the hierarchical structure is associated with a certain subject-term (i.e. nodes at each level in the hierarchy are associated with a certain subject – line the subject for B.1.1 is control Design Styles, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 74 are rejected in the analysis of claim 62 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 75, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein each of the sub-codes at each level of the hierarchical structure is associated with a certain subject-term (i.e. nodes at each level in the hierarchy are associated with a certain subject – line the subject for B.1.1 is control Design Styles, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 75 are rejected in the analysis of claim 61 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 76, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein the codes consist solely of a combination of said sub-codes (A. General Literature, is a combination of A.0, A.1, A.2, and A.m, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 76 are rejected in the analysis of claim 64 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 77, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein information assigned a particular code relates either i) to the subject-term associated with said particular code if the code includes a single sub-code (i.e. A.1 includes only one single sub-category, page 1), or ii) to all subject-terms associated with all sub-codes of said particular code if the code includes more than one sub-code i.e. B.1.4 also includes D.2.2, D.2.4, D.3.2, and D.3.4, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 77 are rejected in the analysis of claim 61 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 78, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein information assigned a particular code relates either i) to the subject-term associated with said particular code if the code includes a single sub-code (i.e. A.1 includes only one single sub-category, page 1), or ii) to all subject-terms associated with all sub-codes of said particular code if the code includes more than one sub-code i.e. B.1.4

also includes D.2.2, D.2.4, D.3.2, and D.3.4, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 78 are rejected in the analysis of claim 62 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 79, Coulter teaches wherein one or more of said codes are distributed together with information and/or products (i.e. the classification system uses codes to index and classify information, page 1).

With respect to claim 80, Coulter teaches wherein an indexing function is provided at each level of said hierarchical structure (i.e. indexing is done for each level in the hierarchy, and for each source, page 3!).

With respect to claim 81, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein at each level of said hierarchical structure data related to subject-terms associated with the sub-codes are available upon entering a particular sub-code (i.e. when you access B.1.1 – Control design Styles, you also have access to Hardwired control, Microprogrammed logic arrays, and Writable control store, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 81 are rejected in the analysis of claim 62 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 82, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein one or more of the sub-codes are converted into the associated subject-terms (i.e. sub codes correspond with the section titles or categories, for example, everyone would

know that B.1.5 deals with Microde Applications, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 82 are rejected in the analysis of claim 61 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 83, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein one or more of the sub-codes are converted into the associated subject-terms (i.e. sub codes correspond with the section titles or categories, for example, everyone would know that B.1.5 deals with Microde Applications, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 83 are rejected in the analysis of claim 62 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 84, Coulter teaches wherein codes complemented by subject-terms are used to search for, access or receive information (i.e. Association for Computing Machinery Computing Classification Systems provides access to electronic information, including published literature, page 1),

With respect to claim 85, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches wherein the code is complemented by a suffix or a prefix (i.e. the code, 'A' can be thought of to contain a suffix of 'General Literature', page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 85 are rejected in the analysis of claim 62 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis..

With respect to claim 86, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches whereby the suffix is used as a filter or to provide additional information (i.e. the code, 'B' can be thought of to contain a suffix of 'Hardware', to provide more information, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 86 are rejected in the analysis of claim 62 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 87, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature. Coulter does not explicitly disclose codes for classification. However, ACM teaches whereby the suffix includes one or more additional subject terms or sub-codes or symbols (i.e. the code, 'B' can be thought of to contain a suffix of 'Hardware', to provide more information, page 1). Therefore, the limitations of claim 62 are rejected in the analysis of claim 44 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 88, Coulter teaches apparatus for performing a search on a database or a network of databases (i.e. ACM database system is a repository of documents, page 1).

With respect to claim 89, Coulter teaches database or a network of databases (i.e. ACM database system is a repository of documents, page 1).

With respect to claim 90, Coulter teaches A computer program adapted to perform the method according to claim 44 when being executed on a computer (i.e.

ACM database system uses a computing classification system program to search for data on a computer, page 1).

With respect to claim 91, Coulter teaches A system for accessing information stored in a database or network of databases, the system comprising a terminal for entering said codes (i.e. ACM database system uses a computing classification system program to search for data on a computer, page 1).

Claims 48, and 68-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulter ("Computing Classification System 1998: Current Status and Future Maintenance Report of the CCS Update Committee", ACM, pages 1-5, January 1998) in view of ACM ("The ACM Computing Classification System (1998)", December 1998, pages 1-30), further in view of ACM (Version) ("ACM Computing Classification System [1998 Version]", December 1998, pages 1-2).

With respect to claim 48, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature, and ACM teaches specific details of the ACM classification system. The combination of Coulter and ACM does not explicitly disclose that all the same codes have the same data structure. However, ACM (Version) teaches wherein all of said sub-codes have the same data structure (i.e. all codes/sub codes have the same data structure – three letter and number coded levels, page 1). Coulter ACM, and ACM (Version) are from the same field of endeavor of allowing data to be classified by the ACM Computing Classification System. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art, having the teachings of Coulter and ACM before him or her, to modify the system of Coulter with the teachings of ACM in order to show a detailed view of how the documents are classified (ACM (Version), page 1). The motivation for doing so would have been to show the structure of the classification (ACM (Version), page 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine ACM (Version) with ACM with Coulter to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claims.

With respect to claim 68, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature, and ACM teaches specific details of the ACM classification system. The combination of Coulter and ACM does not explicitly disclose that all the same codes have the same data structure. However, ACM (Version) teaches wherein all of said sub-codes have the same data structure (i.e. all codes/sub codes have the same data structure – three letter and number coded levels, page 1). Coulter ACM, and ACM (Version) are from the same field of endeavor of allowing data to be classified by the ACM Computing Classification System. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Coulter and ACM before him or her, to modify the system of Coulter with the teachings of ACM in order to show a detailed view of how the documents are classified (ACM (Version), page 1). The motivation for doing so would have been to show the structure of the classification (ACM (Version), page 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine ACM (Version) with ACM with Coulter to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claims

With respect to claim 69, Coulter teaches the ACM Computing Classification System, which allows the classification and indexing of published literature, and ACM teaches specific details of the ACM classification system. The combination of Coulter and ACM does not explicitly disclose that all the same codes have the same data structure. However, ACM (Version) teaches wherein all of said sub-codes have the same data structure (i.e. all codes/sub codes have the same data structure – three letter and number coded levels, page 1). Coulter ACM, and ACM (Version) are from the same field of endeavor of allowing data to be classified by the ACM Computing Classification System. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Coulter and ACM before him or her, to modify the system of Coulter with the teachings of ACM in order to show a detailed view of how the documents are classified (ACM (Version), page 1). The motivation for doing so would have been to show the structure of the classification (ACM (Version), page 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine ACM (Version) with ACM with Coulter to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claims

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEXANDRIA Y. BROMELL whose telephone number is (571)270-3034. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 6:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alexandria Y Bromell
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

AYB
February 14, 2008

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100